SUBJECT No. 3.

Amendment of Village Offices Regulation.

Mr. B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Anekal taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—The Village Offices Regulation may be so amended as to recognise the claims of childless widows to hereditary offices, as in the case of minors.

*Reply of Government.*—Not possible to change the law.

SUBJECT No. 4.

Amendment of the Land Acquisition Regulation.

Mr. K. Chandrasekhariah, Bar Association, Mysore.

*Summary of discussion.*—(*a*) The Land Acquisition Regulation may be so amended as to enable the civil courts to adjudicate and decide whether an alleged public purpose is really such.

(*b*) The orders of Land Acquisition Officers refusing to make references to the civil courts or making improper or illegal references may be made appealable to some Judicial Tribunal.

*Reply of Government.*—(*a*) Not feasible.

(*b*) Noted for consideration.

SUBJECT No. 5.

Amendment of the Breach of Contract Act.

(*a*) Messrs. Veerathappa, Chamrajnagar taluk, M. L. Vardhamanayya, Mysore taluk, M. Subba Rao, Heggaddevankote taluk and Channabasappa, Gundlupet taluk; K. Ramanna, K. Siddappa, N. Sankarappa and K. Channakesavaiya, Tirthahalli taluk,

(*b*) Messrs. B. K. *Garudachar*, Commercial Association, Bangalore, and Manjaiya, Chikmagalur Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—The Breach of Contract Act may be so amended as:—

(*a*) to be made applicable to the agricultural labourers also, and

(*b*) to secure reciprocity under the Act between Mysore and British India.

The members generally represented that the present state of the law impeded agricultural operations and encouraged fraud on the part of labourers, involving serious loss of money to the planters and damage to the planting industry.

It was pointed out that there was nothing in the Act excluding agricultural labour from its operations provided conditions prescribed by law were satisfied.

As regards reciprocity between Mysore and British Provinces it was mentioned that the question depended upon a law being enacted here similar to the Madras Planters' Labour Act, 1903.

*Reply of Government.*—(*a*) The existing provisions are exceptional in themselves and quite adequate.

(*b*) The question is one of some difficulty and is engaging the earnest consideration of Government.

SUBJECT No. 6.

Grant of certain privileges to the Legislative Council.

Messrs. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, C. Subba Rao, K. Shankaranarayana Rao, S. Sitaramaiya and other members of the Shimoga District and Nanjappa Setti, Mysore District Board, Karnick Krishnamurthi Rao, Magadi taluk, and H. Krishnasastri, Krishnarajpete taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(i) Members may each be permitted to ask 12 questions and the total number of questions that may be selected may be fixed at 24 or 36 or may be unlimited.

(ii) Reasons may be given for rejecting questions.

(iii) Effect may be given to the resolutions in regard to the Budget.

Representations (ii) and (iii) were urged on the analogy of similar British Indian Institutions and it was

urged that if more time were needed for answering a larger number of questions, members might be asked to send up questions at least one month before the date of meeting.

*Reply of Government.*—(i) The question of increasing the number of interpellations will be considered.

(ii) Not feasible.

(iii) Not feasible.

SUBJECT NO. 7.

Introduction of certain Acts into Mysore.

(1) Messrs. Singri Nanjappa, Tiptur taluk, and K. Chandrasekhariah, Bar Association, Mysore.
(2) Messrs. Padmanna, Chandrasekhariah and K. Venkatasamiah, Nanjangud taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(1) The Transfer of Property Act, the Easements Act, the Negotiable Instruments Act, and the Trust Act may be introduced into Mysore.

(2) The Criminal Tribes Act may be introduced into Mysore.

*Mr. Venkatasamiah.*—My proposal is that arrangements should be made for Penal Settlements and prevention of offences by criminal tribes.

*Reply of Government.*—(1) The introduction of the Transfer of Property Act, the Easements Act and the Negotiable Instruments Act is under consideration. It is not intended to introduce the Trust Act at present.

(2) A draft Bill is under consideration.

SUBJECT NO. 8.

A Regulation to prevent usury.

Messrs. (*a*) Volahatti Devappa, Gundlupet taluk, G. Girimaji Rao, Kolar taluk, and N. Surappa, Bangalore taluk; and
(*b*) Eregowda, Mudgere taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(*a*) The poor raiyats of the State are being impoverished by paying high rates of interest in kind or cash on loans obtained from sahukars. The existing rate of interest in kind is 100 seers of grain per year for a loan of Rs. 10 or Rs. 2 a month for Rs. 100. The penalty for overdue instalment is one anna for every rupee per month or Rs. 3 per Rs. 100, while some others charge Rs. 5 as interest per week on Rs. 100. Thus money-lenders recover in a year interest equal to the principal lent and in some cases double this principal. No law has been enacted to put this down. A Regulation may be passed to prevent charging exorbitant rate of interest and penalty and empower the courts not to grant decrees in such cases.

(*b*) People in malnad have very often to borrow money for agricultural purposes from foreign merchants at exorbitant rates of interest varying from Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 per cent by way of "ಭತ್ತದ ಬಡ್ಡಿ" and "ಬಿಣಕಟ್ಟು ಬಡ್ಡಿ" and are thus ruined soon. A Regulation may be passed limiting the rate of interest on loans to 12½ per cent.

*Messrs. Devappa and Surappa.*—Interest is charged on balances of account. Sometimes after lapse of years compound interest is charged. Usury law is necessary.

*Messrs. Girimaji Rao and K. Santhanam Iyengar* spoke also in favour of a regulation to prevent usury.